

TYPIFICATION OF THE GENUS *FORESTIERA* (OLEACEAE). — In a note with this title, published in the December *RHODORA* (60: 327 — 328, 1958), Kenneth A. Wilson states that the type species properly is *F. cassinoides* (Willd.) Poir., not *F. porulosa* (Michx.) Poir. (now to be called *F. segregata* (Jacq.) Krug & Urban), as was designated by Marshall C. Johnston in his recent synopsis (*S.W. Nat.* 2: 141, 1957). The question does not involve nomenclature, since both plants not only belong to the same genus, but are even regarded by Johnston as identical. The choice of a type is hardly anything but a bit of pedantic quibbling. But it is perhaps worth pointing out, simply as an illustration of the pitfalls that surround our modern efforts to graft a type method onto the work of botanists who had no conception of such, reasons for rejecting Wilson's choice. Poiret established the genus *Forestiera* in *Encyclop. Méth. — Bot., Suppl.* 2: 664, 1811 (not 1: 132, 1810, where the genus *Adelia* as then accepted by Poiret is treated in detail, and the reader is briefly referred to *Forestiera* for the account of *Adelia* of Michaux). Following the detailed "Caractère générique," Poiret states explicitly, "Ce genre a été établi par Michaux, sous le nom d'*adelia*, auquel M. Willdenow a substitué celui de *borya*. Ces deux noms, déjà employés, m'ont forcé d'en adopter un autre." Michaux had in reality taken the genus over from Browne, whom he cites as author; we might list the former's version as *Adelia* Browne emend. Michaux. Poiret was not acting under any compulsion from modern rules of nomenclature, but even under them he technically would be at liberty to do precisely as he did. He stated unequivocally that his *Forestiera* was a renaming of *Adelia* as treated by Michaux, not by Browne. Hence the type species of *Forestiera* Poiret must be selected from those included by Michaux; it cannot be a fourth species which Michaux did not list. In choosing one of Michaux' three species, it would seem best to take that one which most nearly accords with *Adelia* Browne, *sensu originali*. This is *A. porulosa*. We have then arrived at the same conclusion as

Johnston, though by slightly different details of reasoning. In any case, Wilson's designation of *Forestiera cassinoides* as the type species must be rejected. — LLOYD H. SHINNERS, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY, DALLAS, TEXAS.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON VEGETATIVE REPRODUCTION IN *CAREX TRIBULOIDES* AND *C. PROJECTA*. — Late last June (1959) in Concord, Massachusetts, I collected specimens from an abundant colony of *Carex tribuloides* with many over-wintering prostrate culms bearing at the nodes roots and vigorous leafy shoots. They were growing near the bank of the Concord River in an undisturbed open portion of the Great Meadows. Later in the day, more than a mile upstream on the shady bank of the Assabet River, I collected two plants of *C. projecta* likewise with rooting vegetative shoots on culms of the previous year.

I had not previously encountered this phenomenon in *Carex*, but I do find a short note on the subject in RHODORA 47:39 (1945) by C. A. Weatherby. Although he discovered an incidental allusion by Theodor Holm in 1896 to the occasional development on *C. tribuloides* of transient axillary buds, he could find no other references to the matter. Weatherby appears to have been the first and only person to have called attention to occasional vegetative reproduction in these two closely related species of *Carex*. He, himself, had collected a specimen of *C. projecta* exhibiting this condition and had found ten others in the Gray Herbarium in addition to three of *C. tribuloides* (there are now six). He expressed surprise that a phenomenon so far from being rare should not have been alluded to in print, suggesting that the plethora of poorly collected specimens may be partly responsible. This may well be so. In my own case I did not notice any peculiarity about my specimens until I had dug them. If I had merely snatched a few culms, as so many collectors of a past generation had been contented to do, I would never have seen the tangle of viable over-wintering culms matted on the ground under the lush meadow vegetation.

To supplement Weatherby's count of pertinent material in